DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 057 CS 210 190

AUTHOR Sledd, James
TITLE Product in Process: From Ambiguities of Standard English to Issues That Divide Us.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference on the Teaching of English (4th, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, May 11-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); Educational Policy; *English Instruction; *Language Standardization; National Norms; *Official Languages; Sociolinguistics; *Standard Spoken Usage
IDENTIFIERS Jargon; Modern Language Association; National Council of Teachers of English

ABSTRACT

Standard written English is defined by those in power as a classless and unchanging grapholect, a public idiom in worldwide use that is presently the unofficial official language. However, true standard English is not changeless, but represents a product in constant process, existing though there is conflict and variation within both the norm and the practice. Standard English, as defined by the powerful, is an instrument created by the dominant for purposes of domination. Even schools, colleges, and universities in the United States serve the dominant--the executives of the transnational corporations and their shareholders. When the powerful control the educational system at all levels, teachers of English cannot escape the conflict over standard English. At conferences, teachers talk only to each other and put their trust in organizations like the National Council of Teachers of English and the Modern Language Association, which support established power. Teachers should not look for allies in the resistance of standardization within the established power structure. (SRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276057

Product in Process:

From Ambiguities of Standard English to Issues That Divide Us

James Sledd

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Sledd

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

I. Context [1]

In the United States today, the executives of the transnational corporatiers and their flunkies in "the military-industrial-educational complex"[2] are imposing "a radical technology" on a "highly inegalitarian economy"--a move which is "least onerous and most advantageous to those who are already well off and powerful, . . . most onerous and least advantageous to those who are relatively powerless or relatively poor."[3] One obvious part of this military-industrial-educational strategy is a drive to maintain and extend corporate control of schooling and--more generally--corporate control of the accumulation, storage, and dissemination of knowledge.

We who teach the use of English can expect no honored place in the corporate executives' envisioned world of computerized high technology. The language of their Institutional Voice[4] already differs observably from the Standard English which teachers of English have known and taught. To be sure, we have our own creaky modulations of the Institutional Voice. They are prescribed by the style manuals of our professional societies--societies which by and large accept the social assumptions of the dominant and cultivate modes of expression calculated to set upwardly mobile professionals apart and to reduce lay people to a lower

CS 216190

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

level of mystified awe. "Operate confidently, not defensively," says our Institutional Voice, "knowing that ours is an important profession."[5]

Sad realism compels the acknowledgment, however, that two years after 1984 the English teacher as classroom Galileo[6] is less "marketable" (as the jargon goes) than a computer program "called ISAAC (after Isaac Newton)." ISAAC doesn't grade themes but "understands and solves physics problems, stated in English, in the area of rigid-body statics. . . . Running on a desktop computer, ISAAC reads English at a speed of 5,000 words per minute and solves a complete problem in about five seconds" (Novak 1985). It is ISAAC and his like--electronic Newtons, not classroom Galileos--which promise eager consumers the goodies that they yearn for--electronic corkscrews (say), or "a child's teddy bear equipped with a computer, a temperature sensor, and a radio to control a thermostat." Computerized Pooh can command the room temperature to rise if the child kicks the cover off (Browne 1985), but nobody ever electrified a sorority teddy bear by talking about King Lear. English teachers can hardly even pronounce and certainly can't understand the magic words of entrepreneurs and technologists like those who want to "make space a marketplace." At public expense, the necromancers spangle the firmament with satellites for military-industrial communication while they expand the lexicon with verbified nouns (like to architect), mysterious acronyms (like TRAC, the Texas Reconfigurable Array Computer, with its "banyan interconnection network" [Lipovski 1985]), and unutterable string compounds (like liquid oxygen liquid hydrogen rocket powered single state to orbit reversible boost system).[7]

More ominously, we teachers of English seem equally unable to understand the significance of the innumerable reports which lament "the current crisis of confidence in public schooling" and loudly remind school-people "of the importance

of their contribution to the current national priorities of defense, technology, and productivity."[8] We ought to be terrified, but aren't, at so familiar a spectacle as the University of Texas at Austin. A flagship among the state universities, UT not long ago abruptly terminated the employment of some fifty lecturers in English, especially in English composition, while about the same time it made "unprecedented commitments of additional endowed chairs and research support to accelerate further the development of microelectronics and computer engineering" (Kocurek 1985)--all so that corporate Canutes might repel the Toyota tide, the greatest Japanese threat to their world dominance since the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

I offer you, in these circumstances, an old-fashioned and provincial academic paper. A space-warrior might call it the usual warm moral mush with which decrepit humanists nourish their egos. Before the paper itself, I have attempted a glancing account of our political situation. After the paper, I will try to escape from empty bibble-babble by asking what we can do, situated as we are, to resist those who think of education only as "education for economic growth." Powers like the Committee for Economic Development talk about "employability," "human resource development," "investing in our children."[9] Their very metaphors betray them. Investment is always for the investor's profit.

II. Some arguments

Standard written English, we of the U. S. A. are assured by eminent author-

ities, is a classless and unchanging grapholect, a public idiom in worldwide use which is presently our unofficial official language and which "is likely to continue virtually unchanged as long as our civilization endures" because, the eminences tell us, "we want it that way" (Hirsch 1977, Fisher 1981). It is more useful, however, and more accurate, to speak of standardization in the interactive media of both speech and writing and to speak of standard English not as changeless but as a product in constant process. "Language," wrote I. A. Richards, "is an instrument for controlling our becoming";[10] and the constantly changing spoken and written language which the dominant call standard English is a creation and instrument of the dominant for purposes of domination, but an instrument in being whose becoming creates the possibility of controlling the controllers or escaping their control. "Who d'ya mean we, white man?" The reference varies as speakers identify themselves with either the dominant or the dominated: minorities are now the majority in the schools of Austin, Texas. No teacher of any subject can claim exemption from social and political responsibility, and teachers of English can no longer claim the status (if ever they could, rightly) which Professor Douglas Bush assumed when he rebuked Mr. Secretary Connally for confusing virulence with virility (Bush 1972).

The standardization of standard English was conducted through now familiar stages during the four centuries, roughly, from Chaucerian to Johnsonian times.[11] When Chaucer was born, no single dialect of English was recognized as standard. When Johnson died, a standard had been established for both speech and writing, its approved structure and proper use had been described in authoritative grammars and dictionaries, and the language thus codified and regulated had come to rival or replace both French and Latin in all the functions which may be served by the fully elaborated varieties of a great national and international language.

for
The norm which had been created from the official documents of the central bureaucracies had been successfully imposed throughout England and to a large extent in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales; the ruling class and its intellectual upper servants in the London area had also imposed their judgment of their English speech as better than the speech of the people, better even than the speech of the gentry in the North and West; and as writers in English had created for the privileged a literature which stood comparison with the literatures of Greece and Rome and their derivatives, a language of administrative power had become a language of literary tradition and privileged social status. The exclusionary aspect of a doctrine of correctness had become increasingly evident.

The weakness of Johnson's well-known plea for retarding change is that unless a language changes, it cannot meet the needs of a changing world. Johnson's death was approximately contemporary with England's "take-off" into self-sustaining economic growth, with successful revolution in the Thirteen Colonies (and in France), with maintenance of the Empire in Canada, and with its expansion into Asia, Africa, and the South Pacific. In such circumstances, even if (as literary students) we knew nothing of Lyrical Ballads or The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (where the real language of persons in very low and rustic life was mimicked in ways that would have astonished Wordsworth), still we would predict coincident changes in the standard language as both political and cultural instrument and in people's thought about it.

The old "b-gh" culture of Western Europe could not be transported to Europe's colonies intact. As English, then, became a world language, new linguistic standards had to be developed for new lives in different lands, among greatly differing linguistic and ethnic groups. The conditions of colonial life, and the imposed but widely accepted dogma of colonial inferiority, made the development of autonomous standards slow and difficult, completed only in this century in even the most powerful of the former colonies, the United States.

Despite all differences, however, familiar structures of social and linguistic domination were at least partly replicated throughout the now vanished Empire. One result is a world language of international intelligibility, varying somewhat in lexicon but little in syntax and--among the privileged--sufficiently uniform even in phonology to make communication relatively easy among those who wish to communicate. Ironically, the language by which the Empire had been governed was ultimately turned against imperial domination; and today, world English in many countries is essential in the pursuit of political, social, and personal liberation.

It also remains an instrument of domination by the privileged, not just by powerful aliens but by indigenous elites (sometimes denounced as a new breed of international yuppies) from India to the U. S. Virgin Islands. World English is still primarily the language of the dominant, too often inaccessible to the majority; and more diverse and less widely intelligible varieties range downward, as the dominant would judge, to pidgins and creoles. The condemnation of the nonstandard dialects of English and of the English-based pidgins and creoles, though often shared by their own speakers, ignores the fact that no language and no variety of any language would long survive if it did not serve some purposes for some people better than any other language or variety serves them. It is an arrogant absurdity for the dominant minority to despise the languages and language-varieties of the majority, in which most of the world's work gets done.

From this strange, eventful history, whose last scene remains for an unimaginable future, irreconcilable differences and inescapable responsibilities arise for English-teachers. Every language-variety has both its praxis and its norm or norms, which testify (when a norm becomes conscious and is overtly stated)

that praxis varies. The norm of a standard language, in general based ultimately on the praxis of the dominant, is always conscious, so that an elaborated and codified standard is never a mere emergence but in part a creation (not ex nihilo), the product-in-process of deliberate intervention in linguistic history for the purposes and profit of the intervenors. Standard languages as sociolinguists describe them are in no sense "natural" or universal but have been developed at distinctive stages of relatively recent social evolution and have been purposefully imposed, most typically by centralized national power.

It follows that what was deliberately created in one set of circumstances can be deliberately changed (as always, within limits) in another. It is simply false that there is no alternative to "school English" (Fisher 1981), that the "conservative and normative power" of an established "grapholect" cannot be resisted (Hirsch 1977). In learning, teaching, and using languages and dialects, real choices have really to be made. At least some divisive issues admit no responsible compromise.

The real issues cannot be dealt with until false issues have been set aside. At an academic conference conducted in standard English, there is no point in refuting the assertion that standard English does not exist.[12] To be sure, there is conflict and variation within both norm and praxis (though less variation than in nonstandard varieties), and since that variation not only exists but is closely though not exclusively linked to distinctions of nation, region, sex, age, and social class or subclass, the ambiguities of the standard will increase in a changing, divided society where the masses distrust the dominant. The economic power of the risen redneck in a high-tech world makes the redneck's praxis more important to changes in the norm than either the norm or the praxis of the traditionally educated, and when the dominant close the doors of educa-

tional and economic opportunity to the majority, as current educational "reforms" in the U. S. A. are doing, the nature of the standard will be modified by the resultant sharpening of sociolinguistic stratification; but under all such changes, the standard continues to exist--and continues to exist as an instrument of domination, the primary means of social control. Standard English remains the accent and dialect of the Institutional Voice where the Institutional Voice is Anglophone.

A second false issue is the argument that although standard English does exist, it is <u>not</u> an instrument created by the dominant for purposes of domination (Strevens 1983). The evidence to the contrary is so vast that in brief remarks it can hardly be mentioned and cannot be summarized: the origin of the "grapholect" in Chancery Standard; sixteenth-century descriptions of the then newly recognised standard speech; the collapse of standardized languages like Aelfric's Old English, the Middle English of <u>Ancrene Wisse</u> and related texts, and fifteenth-century Scots, because they either lost or never had the support of centralized national power; the imposition of standard English as the "public language" of the Celtic periphery; the correlations between linguistic variation and social class which sociolinguists have demonstrated in both Britain and the United States; the similar correlations in the Third World as a result of policies like that formulated in Macaulay's "Minute"; the Third World's revolt against external standards after the break-up of the Empire; the similar refusal by many Blacks to accept white English any longer as standard for Black communities; and overt statements and actions, in the immediate past and in the present, by persons claiming authority in the United States. In the 60's, our proponents of bi-dialect(al)ism asserted that students who did not master standard English would be denied "economic opportunity and social acceptance."[13] In the 80's, United States Senators Hayakawa and Huddleston have pushed for a constitutional amendment making English

the one official language of the nation;[14] California has succumbed to fear of the Yellow-Brown Peril, and other states are tremescent; oil refineries in largely Spanish-speaking Corpus Christi (Texas) have imposed English-only job rules;[15] and the College Entrance Examination Board has demanded that all college entrants must already control both the spoken and the written standard[16]--all this at a time when even transitional bilingual programs are under attack and when Reaganite social and educational policies make it quite impossible for the majority of young Americans to meet such demands as those of the College Board. The bi-dialectalists' assertion of the 60's is being officially verified twenty years later.

The last false issue which needs immediate dismissal is the spurious argument whether standard English should be taught. The argument is spurious because absolute opposition to such teaching does not exist but has been invented in a deceitful ploy to discredit real opposition, not to the unqualified teaching of the standard, but to teaching it in wrong ways and for wrong reasons. Moguls of the NCTE have been among the most determined purveyors of this simple falsehood.[17]

The genuine issues which have thus been industriously obscured are questions of motives and methods, of deepest purpose and the best means to accomplish it. In general they fall under the rubric of the Freirean opposition between domestication and liberation, between animal training and the emancipatory education of human beings. In the United States today, when the executives of the transnational corporations and their flunkies are strengthening and extending their control of the educational system at all levels, teachers of English cannot escape the conflict by crying "Peace! peace!" For there is no peace.

The most widespread of the politic evasions is the relativism which destroys

the distinction between standard English and good English and makes reasoned choices impossible by stripping the words good and bad of any meaningful application to languages and language-varieties. The long process of standardization, and continuing use as the linguistic vehicle of all activities which the dominant presume to regulate (including literature), have made standard English the most useful all-purpose dialect we have. That assertion is neither a denial of the unique values of every dialect nor a commitment to foolish notions that literacy in an alphabetically written language works wonders for the cognitive faculties. The assertion is simply an acknowledgment that the slogan "Difference, not deficit!" is false to fact and guarantees that deficit will be perpetuated. If linguistic deprivation and cultural deprivation were not real, protests against injustice would be gratuitous trouble-making.[18]

A second evasion does not deny meaning to the terms good and bad but defines them simplistically by equating good with standard, bad with nonstandard or substandard. Again the possibility of choosing is denied, on the assumption that since the bossed would like to become bosses, they must talk boss-talk so that they may be "upwardly mobile in the mainstream culture"--that is, so that they may encourage the sin of envy by conspicuously wasting more of the world's irreplaceable resources than other wasteful Americans waste, always on the further assumption that the inferior peoples of the Third World are rightfully to be exploited. In the United States, to teach for the goal of upward mobility is tacitly to assume that devotees of that strange abstraction the American nation should enjoy special privilege. One result, if such teaching should be successful, would be that world English would remain primarily a tool for world domination. Present bosses, however, would be pleased by the pedagogic treason, because it would provide them with a docile, efficient "work force" while dis-

couraging real change in the structures of power and class.

For teachers who refuse to equate the good and the standard, the most difficult choices all remain, for good English must be defined. Consensus in such matters of value is certainly impossible and probably undesirable, lest one good custom should corrupt international conferences; but that inconclusive conclusion at least suggests a strong judgment on a last real issue--last for lack of time, not of matter for argument. How much variation from whatever norm they choose should teachers of English accept without protest or should even encourage? How much change, as a consequence of variation, should they also accept or encourage? It is pointless to assume that change in either norm or praxis has been stopped, or can or should be; yet Johnson's argument for retarding at least some changes is only a generalized antecedent to specific opposition by contemporary pedagogues to abuses like doublespeak. As Leavis said, "Life is growth and growth change, and the condition of these is continuity" (Leavis 1975); but how does one treat the product of the past in the present process?

The difficulty of agreement in matters of value, and the fallibility of consensus even when it is achieved, suggest that puzzled teachers should generally accept or maybe encourage more diversity, not less, than they are inclined to. "Maximum diversity compatible with intelligibility" is a good slogan for world English, because English will remain a world language only if its users everywhere can feel that in some sense English is their own, so that diversity and individual identity will be served as well as tradition and wide intelligibility. Attempts to impose a single narrowly regulated standard at the expense of pidgins, creoles, and nonstandard dialects are disastrous.

They are as disastrous at conferences and in classrooms as they are in wider arenas of "the real world." Speaking and writing may be considered as arts of

controlled inference; for it takes two to converse, and unread writing is an abortion. We are using language, that is, when we read or listen as well as when we write or speak, and we frustrate both transactions if we assume a position of strength and attempt, by strong demands on our interlocutors' language, to impose our own ideas and values. That is why the Simoniacs, though they are right in distinguishing is from ought to be, are otherwise distressful. Nitpickers in the name of pure English obstruct the functioning of the language whose imagined purity they claim to protect.

III. Bodement

At least in the United States, our schools, colleges, and universities are not primarily devoted to education for freedom. Primarily, they serve the dominant--in the United States in 1986, the executives of the transnational corporations and their shareholders. To call the world of corporate executives "the free world" is farcical: the free world is the indispensable dream which never will come true. In the corporate world and its appendages, the critical thinking which we talk about has no place except as it is devoted to the service of the dominant or conducted on the educational periphery by suspect students and their suspect teachers. The number of such students and such teachers isn't large. The great majority of students in the U. S. A. don't want a liberatory education: they want degrees as means to jobs that will offer them "the good life" of high status and conspicuous wastefulness. Teachers, though somewhat older, resemble their students and indeed the majority of the human species in this respect--

that reasoned argument rarely overcomes immediate self-interest, narrowly conceived. The least critical thinkers of all are professorial types who imagine that they are quite exempt from these human frailties.

Until masses of people are convinced, then, by some unforeseeable catastrophe, that resistance will hurt less than continued submission, popular revolution will remain impossible in the United States; but vigorous revolution from the Right is actually in progress under self-styled conservatives of both parties, who mean to corrupt our minds and lives in order to satisfy their greed. In these circumstances, teachers who choose resistance must avoid self-dramatization and content themselves to be small voices in their own small wildernesses. Ambitious imperatives without power are damaging because they make those who issue them feel virtuous without doing anything. Awareness of our true situation, and clear statement of it, make a better beginning for the ultimately necessary search for allies.

Some truths about the usual arguments for the forceful imposition of standard English will appear if we consider the standard language as an institution and apply Claire Lerman's description of the Institutional Voice (Lerman 1983). In "any institutional discourse," Lerman says, "the Underlying Topic is still the defence or retention of personal or political power," but for its "discourse of power" the Institutional Voice "uses the language of morality." "The primacy of the institution" (in the present application, standard English) is assumed as "a basic tenet of institutional discourse" on matters linguistic. It becomes a point of "higher morality" to protect the standard language by arguments either pragmatic (without a standard, communication will break down) or theological ("the tongue that Shakespeare spake" must be kept "pure"). "Any threat to those transcendent values" constitutes a "crisis," in which defenders of the standard

protect the nation's glorious linguistic heritage by playing on fears of "the external enemy" (the English of West Africa or South Asia, perhaps) or of "the radicals or dissidents within" (the Black English vernacular, or English Hispanicized). By "defining the issues of the other as a threat to national values," the Institutional Voice suppresses all topics but its own, which by their routine conventionality "preclude substantive discussion." In such rigged arguments, the enforced use of standard English by the dominated as well as the dominant enacts institutional values. Nobody who is anybody listens to the suggestion that English-based Caribbean creole might be developed and standardized as an official national language[19] or that "Black English" might be used and accepted "in the social domain" (Smitherman 1983). Nobody answers the question of which "middle-class verbal habits are functional and desirable" and which are "merely stylistic--or even dysfunctional" (Labov 1970; cf. n. 18).

These insights (if they deserve that honorific) may help to explain why "the constant repetition by experts and curriculum planners of the advice not to teach grammar has scarcely touched the practice of most teachers, who continue to do the one thing that has been constant in English teaching since the eighteenth century" (Pringle 1985). Presumably, "teaching grammar" in this statement of the puzzle does not mean enlightened effort to make the real forms of standard English generally available as one means to some control of one's own life, but rather the teaching of socially graded lexical and syntactic synonyms by drill and constant correction within the framework of Latinate tradition. The trick of such teaching "lies precisely in the way it extorts the essential while seeming to demand the insignificant."[20] The differences between synonyms like convince to and convince that or like finalize and make final are never significant for communication in good faith. In fact, the differences would not serve their

deep purpose as class-markers if they did interfere with good-faith communication, because then everybody would learn them without instruction and the washed could no longer scorn the gamy. Traditional grammatical nit-picking survives because its lack of function makes it functional. It teaches respect for "proper" English and its users, contempt for speech and speakers branded as improper, and unquestioning obedience to even irrational commands. In other words, the grammar class is an academic bootcamp where absurd rituals performed under constant threat and bullying teach recruits that there is no upward road without submissive anguish. Pupils who take such teaching at face value may then go on to become English teachers and to criticize the language of the dominant for its "impurity."

Such absurdities will remain unless and until we teachers of English learn our real place in the world of the corporate executives. We are downwardly mobile, not upward, yet our boasted professionalism (in fact a humble tribute to our masters) is an attempt to distance ourselves from the powerless and to lay some feeble claim to status. We can't do much alone; at our conferences, we only talk, and talk only to each other; but we turn our backs on lowlier victims of our society and put our trust instead in organizations like the NCTE and the MLA, which in the last analysis support established power, no matter what its quality or action. As The Nation said in a recent tribute to Ralph Nader (30 Nov. 1985), "An understanding of the consequences of corporate behavior was the start of the movement that Nader projected"; but how do we move beyond that beginning? Can we find allies whose interests we share and then struggle together for power with, not power over--for institutions whose voices we could respect? Certainly we will never find the needed comrades if we keep looking in wrong places.

Notes

[1] This paper was read at the Fourth International Conference on the Teaching of English, in Ottawa, in May of 1986. I started to call the first part of the paper "Ronnie's Palomino," because I hoped that readers from the Moral Majority would remember Rev. 6:8: "And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him." Eventually I decided that "readers from the Moral Majority" is an oxymoron and that my palaeo-Methodist allusion was too smart-ass. No doubt the hope is deceptive that the high and excellent seriousness of discursive footnotes (defying the editor) will atone for lingering attachment to an abandoned wisecrack.

[2] The extension of the old Republican phrase is from Paul Chilton, "Newspeak: It's The Real Thing," in Nineteen Eighty-Four in 1984, ed. Paul Chilton and Crispin Aubrey (London: Comedia, 1983), p. 39.

[3] Jon Gower Davies, The Evangelistic Bureaucrat (Tavistock, 1972), quoted from Colin Ward, "Big Brother Drives a Bulldozer," in Chilton and Aubrey, p. 95.

[4] Anthony Adams in Tchudi (n. 5 below) explains the concept of the Institutional Voice, on which he quotes Chilton (n. 2 above), who describes the work of Claire Lindegren Lerman, "Dominant Discourse: The Institutional Voice and Control of Topic," in Language, Image, Media, ed. Howard Davis and Paul Walton (New York: St. Martin's, 1983), pp. 75-103. Only I am guilty of my (mis)treatment of the concept.

[5] John Dixon, report of "Study Group 1: Language, Politics, and Public Affairs," in Language, Schooling, and Society, ed. Stephen N. Tchudi (Upper Montclair, N. J.: Boynton/Cook, 1985), p. 143.

[6] A good teacher of English, an I. V. has exuberated (Garth Boomer, "English Teaching: Art and Science," in Tchudi, pp. 101-118), is simultaneously "in-dweller, imaginer, psychologist, experimenter, theoretician, scientist, technician, designer, knower, believer, controller, shaper, sculptor, coach, demonstrator, teacher, metaphysicist, illuminator, commentator, politician, battler, provider, servant, connoisseur, reflector, critic"--in sum, "a daVinci and a Galileo."

[7] The prize catch by David McNeill, "Speaking of Space," Science, 152 (1966), 875-880, as annotated by Ron Scollon, "Language, Literacy, and Learning: An Annotated Bibliography," in Literacy, Language, and Learning, ed. David R. Olson, Nancy Torrance, and Angela Hildyard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 420.

[8] A National Agenda for the Eighties. Report of the President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties (Washington, 1980), p. 84.

[9] Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1985), pp. iii-v.

[10] Speculative Instruments (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1955), p. 9, quoted from Ann E. Berthoff, "Is Teaching Still Possible?" College English, 46 (1984), 743-755.

[11] Vexed reader, we both have a nasty feeling that I've said all this before, but for the life of me I can't remember where. Let the dubious reference read "[redacted] (?) once upon a time."

[12] "S[tandard] A[merican] E[nglish] is an idealization. Nobody speaks this dialect, and if somebody did, we wouldn't know it because SAE is not defined

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

precisely" (Victoria Fromkin and Robert Rodman, An Introduction to Language, 3d ed. [New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983], p. 251.

[13] Language Programs for the Disadvantaged (NCTE, 1965), p. 222.

[14] See Huddleston's S. J. Res. 167, Congressional Record, 21 Sept. 1983, and the propaganda of Hayakawa's national organization U.S.-English. Professor Richard Freed of Eastern Kentucky University sent me my copy of Huddleston's resolution.

[15] New York Times, 26 Aug. 1981, p. A17.

[16] Academic Preparation for College (New York: The College Board, 1983), pp. 8, 9, 15.

[17] Repeated exposure of the falsehood does not check its propagation. See College English, 38 (1976), 234-241, but then Donna Christian, Language Arts and Dialect Differences (Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1979), p. 12.

[18] At least in their insistence on the distinction between what is and what ought to be, the otherwise distressful Simoniacs are right. For scholarly judgments of various sorts against unqualified linguistic relativism, see Charles-James N. Bailey, "The New Linguistic Framework and Language Planning," Linguistics, No. 158 (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), p. 154; Paul L. Garvin, "Some Comments on Language Planning," in Advances in Language Planning, ed. Joshua A. Fishman (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), pp. 72, 74; Dell Hymes, "Speech and Language: On the Origins and Foundations of Inequality Among Speakers," in Language as a Human Problem, ed. Morton Bloomfield and Einar Haugen (New York: W. W. Norton, 1973), pp. 59, 63; James Sledd, "Linguistic Relativism: The Divorce of Word from Work,"

in Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk, ed. Sidney Greenbaum, et al. (London: Longman, 1980), pp. 256-263. The diversity of the cited sources, casually collected from a personal library, is significant. Of course there are no relativists in action, not theory, as appears from all practical discussion, like William Labov's wrongly neglected challenge: "Before we train working class speakers to copy middle class speech patterns wholesale, it is worth asking just which aspects of this style are functional for learning and which are matters of prestige and fashion" (The Study of Nonstandard English [NCTE, 1970], p. 38). Though even a distinguished scholar may be afflicted by the animal-trainer's we/they syndrome, the affliction weakens the challenger, not the unanswered challenge.

[19] Hubert Devonish, "Towards the Establishment of an Institute for Creole Language Standardization and Development in the Caribbean," in Studies in Caribbean Language, ed. Lawrence D. Carrington et al. (St. Augustine, Trinidad: Society for Caribbean Linguistics, 1983), pp. 300-316. I am indebted to Ian Hancock for the loan of this book.

[20] Pierre Bourdieu, Outline of Theory and Practice, quoted from Henry A. Giroux, Theory and Resistance in Education (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1983), p. 40.

Works Cited

Academic Preparation for College. New York: The College Board, 1983.

Bailey, Charles-James N. "The New Linguistic Framework and Language Planning." Linguistics, 158 (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), pp. 153-157.

Berthoff, Ann E. "Is Teaching Still Possible?" College English, 46 (1984), 743-755.

Boomer, Garth. "English Teaching: Art and Science." In Language, Schooling, and Society. Ed. Stephen N. Tchudi. Upper Montclair, N. J.: Boynton/Cook, 1985, pp. 101-118.

Browne, James C. "Black Holes and Teddy Bears." Discovery: Research and Scholarship at the University of Texas, 9, No. 3 (1985), 22-25.

Bush, Douglas. "Polluting Our Language." The American Scholar, 41 (Spring, 1972), 238-247.

Chilton, Paul. "Newspeak: It's The Real Thing." In Nineteen Eighty-Four in 1984. Ed. Paul Chilton and Crispin Aubrey. London: Comedia, 1983.

Christian, Donna. Language Arts and Dialect Differences. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1979.

Devonish, Hubert. "Towards the Establishment of an Institute for Creole Language Standardization and Development in the Caribbean." In Studies in Caribbean Language. Ed. Lawrence D. Carrington, et al. St. Augustine, Trinidad: Society for Caribbean Linguistics, 1983, pp. 300-316.

Dixon, John. "Study Group 1: Language, Politics, and Public Affairs." In Language, Schooling, and Society. Ed. Stephen N. Tchudi. Upper Montclair, N. J.: Boynton/Cook, 1985, pp. 135-144.

Fisher, John H. "School English and Public Policy." College English, 43 (1981), 856-57.

Leavis, F. R. The Living Principle. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1975.

Fromkin, Victoria, and Robert Rodman. An Introduction to Language. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, 1983.

Garvin, Paul L. "Some Comments on Language Planning." In Advances in Language Planning. Ed. Joshua A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1974, pp. 69-78.

Giroux, Henry A. Theory and Resistance in Education. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1983.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. The Philosophy of Composition. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1977.

Hymes, Dell. "Speech and Language: On the Origins and Foundations of Inequality Among Speakers." In Language as a Human Problem. Ed. Einar Haugen and Morton Bloomfield. New York: Norton, 1973, pp. 45-71.

Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1985.

Kocurek, W. Neal. "Comment." Discovery, 9, No. 3 (1985), 4-5.

Labov, William. The Study of Nonstandard English. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1970.

Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1965.

Lerman, Claire Lindegren. "Dominant Discourse: The Institutional Voice and Control of Topic." In Language, Image, Media. Ed. Howard Davis and Paul Walton. New York: St. Martin's, 1983, pp. 75-103.

Lipovski, G. Jack. "T*R*A*C." Discovery, 9, No. 3 (1985), 13-16.

A National Agenda for the Eighties. Report of the President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties. Washington, D. C., 1980.

Novak, Gordon S., Jr. "Artificial Intelligence." Discovery, 9, No. 3 (1985), 10-12.

Pringle, Ian. "English Language, English Culture, English Teaching." In Language, Schooling, and Society. Ed. Stephen N. Tchudi. Upper Montclair,

N. J.: Boynton/Cook, 1985, pp. 119-131.

Scollon, Ron. "Language, Literacy, and Learning: An Annotated Bibliography." In Literacy, Language, and Learning. Ed. David R. Olson, Nancy Torrance, and Angela Hildyard. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985, pp. 412-426.

Sledd, James. "Language Differences and Literary Values." College English, 38 (1976), 234-241.

- - - - - - - - - - -. "Linguistic Relativism: The Divorce of Word from Work." In Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk. Ed. Sidney Greenbaum, et al. London: Longman, 1980, pp. 256-263.

Smitherman, Geneva. "Language and Liberation." Journal of Negro Education, 52, No. 1 (Winter 1983), 15-23.

Strevens, Peter. "What is 'Standard English'?" In Readings in English as an International Language. Ed. Larry E. Smith. Oxford: Pergamon, 1983, pp. 87-93.

Ward, Colin. "Big Brother Drives a Bulldozer." In Nineteen Eighty-Four in 1984. Ed. Paul Chilton and Crispin Aubrey. London: Comedia, 1983.